COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF *CACATUA*.

Z.N.(S.) 1647

(see volume 20, pages 372–374; volume 21, pages 156–161)

By Allan R. Phillips (*Instituto de Biología, Universidad Nacional Autonóma de México, México, D.F.*)

Issues are clarified when viewed in perspective. The International Code of Zoological Nomenclature was designed to achieve stability; the plenary powers are an emergency measure in case the Code alone fails to protect important (especially medicinal) names like *Musca*, *Aedes*, *Gallus*, *Columba*, *Felis*, or *Canis* from technical upsets. They are also useful where zoologists cannot agree on important old names and their types, like *Colymbus*, or to avoid confusion and constant name-changing brought about by long-overlooked old names. In this, as all know, they must express the will of zoologists *in general*, not of small but noisy cliques. Their use by such groups has already called forth protests and bids fair to return us to chaos, with each zoologist accepting such decisions as *he* feels to be well-founded and rejecting the remainder. Thus the main issue is continued respect for the Commission.

Surely the present case is a " tempest in a teapot " in which zoologists at large are uninterested. No important danger threatens anything except certain ego's. The Commission can best serve zoology, in such cases, by insisting on application of the long-approved Rules, the well-known earliest name having priority. This will increase universal respect for its decisions as being impartial and in the best interests of stability. It will also decrease the Commission's work load by discouraging future applications for relief from the Rules without *urgent* basis.

It is also most desirable that the Commission, in cases which *do* seem to involve urgent issues, make long and thorough investigations through independant specialists to avoid any possibility of being influenced by untrue or misleading statements in the applications submitted to it. It cannot but lose respect by making decisions on the basis of what limited information may be, at the time, available to it, rather than on the basis of *all* available data. Maintenance of the highest standards at all times is of utmost importance from *everyone's* standpoint, unless there be those who would destroy the Commission's reputation by using it as a cat's-paw for their personal ends.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR *PITHECOPS* HORSFIELD, 1828. Z.N.(S.) 1675

(see volume 22, pages 69–71, 209–210)

By L. E. Couchman (*West Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*)

I have received a separate concerning an application by the late F. Hemming suggesting a type-species fixation for *Pithecops* Horsfield, which would have the effect of upsetting the corrected use of the name *Zizula hylax* Fabricius as published in 1940 by A. S. Corbet.

I most strongly support Col. Cowan in his application, which would have the effect of continuing Corbet's correction published twenty-five years ago (and subsequently widely accepted) and allow us in Australia to continue to use the correct name *Zizula hylax attenuata* Lucas.

Although I did not put this combination into print until 1962, in correspondence and discussion with the late Dr. G. A. Waterhouse and others, the corrected name has been used almost since the date of Corbet's discovery in 1940, and following my suggestion, my friend I. F. B. Common has used the corrected combination (*Zizula hylax attenuata* Lucas) in his handbook to the Australian butterflies published by the Jacaranda Press in Brisbane last year.

Hemming's application would have the effect of reverting back to the former, incorrect usage of *hylax* Fabricius for the *Pithecops* species, would revive the name *gaika* Trimen for the *Zizula* species, and upset a perfectly normal correction which has been accepted in Australia almost since the date of its publication by Corbet. Such a reversal now would cause endless confusion and surely bring the International Commission into contempt for illogical name-changing.

I trust the Commission will act as suggested by Col. Cowan and thus continue the nomenclature corrected by Corbet and accepted by writers in Africa, Asia and Australia.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED ADDITION OF *AMBLEMA* RAFINESQUE 1820, TO THE OFFICIAL LIST. Z.N.(S.) 1699

(see volume 22, pages 196–197 and 341)

By Fred R. Woodward (*Museum and Art Gallery, Paisley, Scotland*)

I agree completely with Dr. Clarke and Dr. Clench that the name *Amblema* Rafinesque, 1820, should be placed on the Official List of Generic Names and that *Amblema* Rafinesque, 1819, should be placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology.

The fact that Rafinesque first described the genus *Amblema* in 1819 with *Amblema ovalis* as sole species and subsequently redescribed the genus in the following year without even mentioning his previous descriptions or *A. ovalis* is not surprising in that Isaac Lea as far back as 1832 writes (on page 8 of the first edition of his " Synopsis of the Naiades ")—" It will be observed that the works of M. Rafinesque are but little quoted. This has arisen from the utter impossibility of satisfying myself as to his species. The cause of which was, at an early period, the abandonment of pursuing the impracticable task of making them out. His own discrepancy in the names sent to Ferussac, and those which are attached to specimens here, together with the want of accordance in the tables made out by his friends, have induced me to regard his claims as being too slender to rely upon the decisions, so contradictory of the several parties, in the (page 9) absence of the individual specimens noted."

The fact that *Amblema costata* Rafinesque, can be readily identified from Rafinesque's original description coupled with the confirmation resulting from Vanatta's examination of the Rafinesque–Poulson type (1915, " Rafinesque's Types of *Unio.*, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **67** : 556) leaves no doubt as to the validity of this species, and since this species was selected by Frierson in 1914 as the type-species of *Amblema* Rafinesque, 1820, whilst *Amblema* Rafinesque, 1819, was apparently unidentifiable then it would, in my opinion, be in the interests of nomenclatural stability to ignore Rafinesque's 1819 usage of *Amblema* entirely.

It is highly desirable that this course of action should be taken since the alternative would be the erection of a further unfamiliar genus which would only help to increase unnecessarily the nomenclatural complexities of the North American Naiades.

Rafinesque gives the Ohio River and tributaries of the Kentucky as the type localities for *Amblema costata* Rafinesque.

WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR THE DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR *STIZUS* LATREILLE [1802–1803]. Z.N.(S.) 1710

By R. M. Bohart (*University of California, Davis, U.S.A.*)

Some new information has recently come to light that bears on our recent proposal concerning the type-species of *Stizus* Latreille (see Bohart and Menke, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **22** (4) : 255–256).

It appears that Blanchard [1846] (in the " Disciples Edition " of Cuvier's " Le Règne Animal, Les Insectes, Atlas," part 2, plate 121, fig. 3) validly designated " *Stizus ruficornis* " (=*Larra ruficornis* of Fab. 1804, =*Bembex ruficornis* Fabricius, 1787, =*Vespa ruficornis* Forster, 1771) as type-species of *Stizus*. On the title page of the